

REMARKS

This application is believed to be in condition for allowance at the time of the next Office action.

The Office action rejects claims 7 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over OKUNO in view of LEITMANN. Reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested for the following reasons:

The Office action states that the primary OKUNO reference discloses a film winding device comprising a spring attachment hollow 6b, a film-press spring 8 having a main body, an end section, a pressing arm for engaging the film, and a fitting arm. The Office action notes that the spring 8 is press fit into the attachment hollow 6b.

The Office action acknowledges that the primary OKUNO reference does not disclose a slip prevention claw. It is this feature for which the secondary LEITMANN reference is offered.

The Office action states that the LEITMANN reference teaches providing a spring device 10 having a main body with arms 12 and support portion 11 with a projecting slip prevention claw 24 engaging a sidewall of bore 21 to assist in retaining the spring device in the bore.

Applicant notes that the device of LEITMANN includes arms 12, as acknowledged by the Office action. However, the slip prevention claw 24 of LEITMANN is arranged not on the arms 12, but rather on the support portion 11, entirely opposite the arms

12. Accordingly, were one to adapt the spring of the primary OKUNO reference to incorporate the claw of the secondary LEITMANN reference, such claw would be positioned not on the turned-back section of the film-press spring 8 that is in contact with the longer side of the attachment hollow 6b, but instead would be positioned on the portion of the spring 8 that is between the end of the spring that makes contact with the film and the curved portion of the spring that is embedded in the attachment hollow 6b. To do otherwise would be to ignore the implicit teachings of LEITMANN as to the arrangement of the claw 24 with respect to the arms 12.

The Office action further states that LEITMANN teaches engaging the claw 24 with the same wall that is pressed by mounting portion 11 of spring 14. However, this characteristic is not a recited feature of the present invention. Instead, claim 7 in its current form recites that the fitting arm (construed by the Office action as corresponding to the arms 12 of LEITMANN) presses the same surface that is engaged by the slip prevention claw. This is entirely contrary to the teaching of LEITMANN. Moreover, since only the LEITMANN reference is the only identified source for teaching or suggestion of a claw, the further teachings or suggestion of this reference related to the positioning of such claw cannot merely be ignored.

Accordingly, were one of skill in the art to consider both the OKUNO and LEITMANN references without the benefit of the

teachings of the present application, such person might arrive at a spring comparable to that of OKUNO incorporating the claw of LEITMANN, but under no circumstances would such claw be arranged with respect to a fitting arm as it is now recited in claim 7.

For all these reasons, applicant respectfully requests that the present rejection of claim 7 be withdrawn.

Applicant notes that all other claims pending in the application have been allowed.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 25-0120 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17.

Respectfully submitted,

YOUNG & THOMPSON



---

Robert J. Patch, Reg. No. 17,355  
745 South 23<sup>rd</sup> Street  
Arlington, VA 22202  
Telephone (703) 521-2297  
Telefax (703) 685-0573  
(703) 979-4709

RJP/fb